

REMARKS

This application, as amended herein, contains claims 1 - 24, 28 - 30, and newly added claims 31 - 35. Claims 25 - 27 have been cancelled.

In view of claims 25 - 27 having been cancelled, the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection is moot.

Claim 6 has been amended to state that the general structure of a digital document is maintained. Thus, there is no conflict with claim 8. A detailed discussion of this feature of the invention may be found in paragraph [0081] on page 17 of the specification. It is thus submitted that claim 8 is now definite within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-10, and 12-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vu et al. Claims 3, 8 and 11 were rejected as obvious over Vu et al. In view of the amendments made herein, and the remarks below, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention is directed, generally, to deriving different views for the same document, allowing viewing of the entire document, and all of its elements, with different emphasis placed on different elements in different views, to permit easy viewing. Vu et al. do not teach or suggest doing this, but instead use different documents (training documents) to establish an historical database, and categorizes a new document to determine which

historical layout to use for that new document. For the specific reasons set forth for various claims below, it is submitted that view does not teach or suggest Applicants' invention.

Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 1, as amended herein, is directed to a digital document browsing system comprising a layout engine, for determining the layout of a digital document based on digital document display form historical data for said document, acquired previously; a view generator, for generating, in accordance with said layout determined by said layout engine, data relating to the display form of said digital document; and a user interface, for displaying said digital document on a display device based on said data relating to said display form generated by said view generator. For the reasons in the immediately preceding paragraph, it is submitted that claim 1 is patentable.

Claim 2 states that the layout engine employs historical data when allocating a display area, for the display form of the digital document, for each element constituting said digital document. Paragraph [0074], last sentence of Vu et al. clearly teaches away from claim 2, in that the summary selector 17 of Vu et al. flags features so that they are ignored during the summary generation process. Thus, these features are not displayed. This is exactly the opposite of Applicants' invention, as set forth in claim 2, which specifies that all elements are displayed. Thus, claim 2 is directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 6 has been amended to specify that all elements are displayed. For the same reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 2, it is submitted that claim 6 is also directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 9 is patentable for similar reasons to those set forth for claim 1. Specifically, summaries are prepared based on historical data related to display forms previously used for display of the same document. It is submitted that claim 6 is not anticipated or rendered obvious by Vu et al., and is thus also directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 12 is patentable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 9.

Claim 15 has been amended to state that the structure of the digital document is maintained so as to include all of its elements. Again, in the last sentence of paragraph [0074], Vu et al teach away from this approach. Thus, claim 15 is also patentable.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite a summarization history database, in which historical data for the summarization of sentences in a document is stored; and a summarization engine, for summarizing sentences based on said historical data stored in said summarization history database for said document. Again, this is contrary to the teachings of Vu et al., which uses historical data of a set of different (training) documents. Thus, it is submitted that claim 19 is patentable.

Claim 21 has been amended to recite a summary that is prepared based on historical data related to a display form for the document that was previously, used for the document. Further all elements of the document are displayed on one screen. Vu et al. does not teach or suggest these approaches, as noted above. Thus, it is submitted that claim 21 is patentable.

Claim 22 recited that areas are allocated to elements based on importance. Claim 22 has been amended to recite that all elements of the document are presented on one screen. Again, this is contrary to the last sentence of paragraph [0074] of Vu et al. Thus, it is submitted that claim 22 is patentable.

Claim 23 recites obtaining a target sentence to be summarized; obtaining historical data related to a summary for said target sentence from a summarization history database in which historical data are stored that are related to a previous summarization of a document containing said sentence; and determining which parameters are required for the preparation of said summary based on said historical data, and preparing said summary of said target sentence based on said parameters. Again, this is patentably distinguishable from Vu et al., where unrelated training documents are used.

In view of the amendments made to claims 28, 29 and 30, and for reasons stated above with respect to analogous amendments made in other claims, as discussed above, it is

submitted that claims 28, 29 and 30 are also directed to patentable subject matter.

Newly added claims 31 - 35 further distinguish Applicants' invention from Vu et al. Specifically, newly added claim 31 and 32 state that the user interface is configured to receive a view update request based on an operation performed by a user, the user interface causing the view generator to generate a new view in response to the view update request. Support for these claims may be found in the specification at page 12, paragraph [0065]. The only possibly pertinent teaching in Vu et al. concerning display is set forth in the last sentence of paragraph [0020] on page 2 of Vu et al. Thus, claims 31 and 32 are patentable. Claim 33 is similar in many respects to claims 31 and 32, and the same rationale applies.

Claim 34 depends from claim 18 and recites that all elements of the digital document are displayed on one screen. Again this is in sharp contrast to Vu et al., where certain elements may not be displayed at all. Claim 34 is directed to patentable subject matter.

Claim 35 depends from claim 6 and specifies that importance levels increase as time increases since information was last displayed. Support for this claim may be found in the last paragraph of paragraph [0079], on page 16, of the specification. Vu et al. teaches nothing of the kind. Claim 35 is directed to patentable subject matter.

The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above. These claims have further recitations, which in combination with those of the claim from which they depend are not taught or suggested by the art of record. For the reasons set forth above these claims are also directed to patentable subject matter.

Please charge deposit account no. 50-0510 in the amount of \$100 for two additional dependent claims. A duplicate of this last page is enclosed.

A check for \$450 for a two-month extension of time to file this paper is enclosed. Although the Office Action of March 11, 2005 indicated a two-month response time, the undersigned indicated in a paper filed on March 22, 2005, that the period for response to a substantive action on the merits should be three months. In subsequent conversations with Examiner Basehoar, and Examiner Hong, it was agreed that the undersigned would simply make note of this in responding to the Office Action, and that no further action was needed to correct the term for response. Thus, no further fee for an extension of time is required. However, if any further fee is required, it is requested that deposit account no. 502244 be charged for such fee.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277  
23 Southern Road  
Hartsdale, NY 10530

8/11/2005  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094



The remaining claims depend from one of the independent claims discussed above. These claims have further recitations, which in combination with those of the claim from which they depend are not taught or suggested by the art of record. For the reasons set forth above these claims are also directed to patentable subject matter.

Please charge deposit account no. 50-0510 in the amount of \$100 for two additional dependent claims. A duplicate of this last page is enclosed.

A check for \$450 for a two-month extension of time to file this paper is enclosed. Although the Office Action of March 11, 2005 indicated a two-month response time, the undersigned indicated in a paper filed on March 22, 2005, that the period for response to a substantive action on the merits should be three months. In subsequent conversations with Examiner Basehoar, and Examiner Hong, it was agreed that the undersigned would simply make note of this in responding to the Office Action, and that no further action was needed to correct the term for response. Thus, no further fee for an extension of time is required. However, if any further fee is required, it is requested that deposit account no. 502244 be charged for such fee.

Respectfully submitted,

David Aker  
David Aker, Reg. No. 29,277  
23 Southern Road  
Hartsdale, NY 10530

8/11/2005  
Date

Tel. & Fax 914 674-1094